UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 96-1791

HAZELENE B. MCRAE,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

SHIRLEY S. CHATER, COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL SECURITY,

Defendant - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina, at Rockingham. James A. Beaty, Jr., District Judge. (CA-94-727-3)

Argued: May 6, 1997 Decided: June 19, 1997

Before MURNAGHAN and NIEMEYER, Circuit Judges, and STAMP, Chief United States District Judge for the Northern District of West Virginia, sitting by designation.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

ARGUED: John Francis Eichorn, Rockingham, North Carolina, for Appellant. John Carl Stoner, Assistant Regional Counsel, Office of the General Counsel, SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION, Atlanta, Georgia, for Appellee. ON BRIEF: Tamela G. Clayton, Rockingham, North Carolina, for Appellant. Frank W. Hunger, Assistant Attorney General, Walter C. Holton, Jr., United States Attorney, Mary Ann Sloan, Acting Chief Counsel, Region III, Mack A. Davis, Acting Deputy Chief Counsel, Haila Naomi Kleinman, Supervisory Assistant Regional Counsel, SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION, Atlanta, Georgia, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit. See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

Plaintiff-Appellant Hazelene McRae filed claims for a period of disability, disability insurance benefits, and supplemental security income. The Administrative Law Judge ("ALJ") denied her claims because he found that she retained the residual functional capacity to perform a limited range of light and sedentary work. The district court affirmed.

McRae stated on her benefits application and testified at the ALJ hearing that she performed a wide range of housework and cared for her invalid family members on a daily basis, she failed to introduce any medical evidence that she was totally disabled, and a vocational expert testified that many jobs existed in North Carolina that McRae could perform. We therefore find that substantial evidence supports the ALJ's finding. See Smith v. Schweiker, 795 F.2d 343, 345 (4th Cir. 1986). The district court's opinion is, therefore,

AFFIRMED.